

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

HUSSEIN S. HUSSEIN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ADEL ERSEK; et al.,

Defendants.

3:07-cv-0056-LRH-VPC

ORDER

Before the court is plaintiff Hussein S. Hussein's ("Hussein") objection to the magistrate judge's order denying his motion for sanctions and defendants' cross-motion for sanctions (Doc. #102¹). Doc. 114. Defendants filed a response (Doc. #130) to which Hussein replied (Doc. #136).

Local Rule IB 3-1 authorizes a district judge to reconsider any pretrial matter referred to a magistrate judge pursuant to LR IB 1-3 where it has been shown that the magistrate judge's order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

Here, Hussein objects to the magistrate's denial of his motion for sanctions (Doc. #90) arguing that the magistrate summarily dismissed his motion without directly referencing the evidence and legal authority in support. Specifically, Hussein takes issue with the broad sweeping language of the magistrate's order, namely, "the court has reviewed plaintiff's motion (Doc. #90),

¹ Refers to the court's docket entry number.

1 and it is denied” (Doc. #102). *See* Doc. #114.

2 Initially, the court notes that although the order itself is brief, the magistrate heard argument
3 on Hussein’s motion for sanctions, along with several other motions he filed on September 15,
4 2009. Thus, the court finds that Hussein’s motion received adequate attention and review from the
5 magistrate judge and that Hussein’s objection to the order’s brevity is therefore, without merit.
6 Further, the magistrate’s brevity is necessary in light of Hussein’s 610 page motion. The court is
7 always conscious of the public’s interest in expeditious litigation and the court’s own need to
8 manage its docket. *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 52 (9th Cir. 1995).

9 Additionally, the court finds that Hussein has failed to show that the magistrate’s order is
10 either contrary to law or clearly erroneous. Hussein simply re-alleges his arguments for sanctions
11 based upon defendants alleged fraudulent conduct which the magistrate discounted. Hussein has
12 not shown to this court that the magistrate’s decision was in error. Accordingly, the court shall
13 affirm the magistrate judge’s order.

14
15 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff’s objection to the magistrate judge’s order
16 (Doc. #114) is DENIED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the magistrate judge’s order denying plaintiff’s motion
18 for sanctions (Doc. #102) is AFFIRMED.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED this 7th day of April, 2010.



21
22
23 LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
24
25
26